arXiv:1608.03414v1 [math.FA] 11 Aug 2016

Pointwise Multipliers for Sobolev and Besov Spaces of Dominating Mixed Smoothness

Van Kien Nguyen*[a,b] and Winfried Sickel†[a]

[a]Friedrich-Schiller-University Jena, Ernst-Abbe-Platz 2, 07737 Jena, Germany
[b]University of Transport and Communications, Dong Da, Hanoi, Vietnam

August 12, 2016

Abstract

Under certain restrictions we describe the set of all pointwise multipliers in case of Sobolev and Besov spaces of dominating mixed smoothness. In addition we shall give necessary and sufficient conditions for the case that these spaces form algebras with respect to pointwise multiplication.

1 Introduction

The regularity concepts related to Sobolev and Besov spaces of dominating mixed smoothness are standard in *Approximation Theory* [26], *Numerical Analysis* [2], [20] and *Information-Based Complexity* [14], [15], [16]. However, there is also some interest in *Learning Theory* in those classes, at least in $S_2^m W(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and $S_{2,2}^r B(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $r > 0$, see [23], [8]. Recently we have been asked by Lev Markhasin and Ingo Steinwarth about pointwise multipliers for those classes. By dealing with this problem it turned out that these problems become more difficult compared to the isotropic situation. It will be the aim of this paper to describe this in detail.

As it is well-known, Sobolev spaces $W_p^m(\mathbb{R}^d)$ form an algebra with respect to pointwise multiplication if $m > d/p$. This means there exists a constant c_1 such that

$$\| f \cdot g \,|W_p^m(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \le c_1 \, \| f \,|W_p^m(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \, \| g \,|W_p^m(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \tag{1.1}$$

holds for all $f, g \in W_p^m(\mathbb{R}^d)$. In this paper we shall deal with a generalization of this fact to tensor product Sobolev spaces $S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d)$ where

$$S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d) \;:=\; \underbrace{W_p^m(\mathbb{R}) \otimes_{\alpha_p} W_p^m(\mathbb{R}) \otimes_{\alpha_p} \ldots \otimes_{\alpha_p} W_p^m(\mathbb{R})}_{\text{d times}} .$$

Here $1 < p < \infty$ and α_p denotes the p-nuclear norm. For a moment we concentrate on the two-dimensional case. Using the cross-norm property of $S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and (1.1) we conclude for tensor

*E-mail: kien.nguyen@uni-jena.de, kiennv@utc.edu.vn
†E-mail: winfried.sickel@uni-jena.de

products $f = f_1 \otimes f_2$ and $g = g_1 \otimes g_2$ with $f_1, f_2, g_1, g_2 \in W_p^m(\mathbb{R})$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \| f \cdot g \,|S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^2)\| &= \| (f_1 \cdot g_1) \otimes (f_2 \cdot g_2) \,|S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^2)\| = \| f_1 \cdot g_1 \,|W_p^m(\mathbb{R})\| \cdot \| f_2 \cdot g_2 \,|W_p^m(\mathbb{R})\| \\ &\le c_1^2 \, \| f_1 \,|W_p^m(\mathbb{R})\| \, \| g_1 \,|W_p^m(\mathbb{R})\| \, \| f_2 \,|W_p^m(\mathbb{R})\| \, \| g_2 \,|W_p^m(\mathbb{R})\| \\ &= c_1^2 \, \| f_1 \otimes f_2 \,|S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^2)\| \, \| g_1 \otimes g_2 \,|S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^2)\| \\ &= c_1^2 \, \| f \,|S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^2)\| \, \| g \,|S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^2)\| \,. \end{aligned} \tag{1.2}$$

Here c_1 is the same constant as in (1.1) for $d = 1$. Since $\| \cdot \,|S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^2)\|$ is an uniform cross-norm it follows that in this particular situation where f is given by a tensor product the linear operator $T_f : \; g \mapsto f \cdot g$ maps $S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^2)$ into itself, see, e.g., [4, Lemma 1.30]. Hence, any operator T_f, where

$$f = \sum_{k=1}^{N} f_{k,1} \otimes f_{k,2} \,, \qquad f_{k,1}, \, f_{k,2} \in W_p^m(\mathbb{R}) \,, \tag{1.3}$$

maps $S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^2)$ into itself. The set of functions defined in (1.3) forms a dense set in $S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^2)$. However, the present situation does not allow to conclude that all functions $f \in S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^2)$ generate an operator T_f which maps $S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^2)$ into itself. As a consequence of (1.2) we only get

$$\| f \cdot g \,|S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^2)\| \le c_1^2 \Big(\sum_{k=1}^{N} \| f_{k,1} \otimes f_{k,2} \,|S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^2)\| \Big) \, \| g \,|S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^2)\|$$

In what follows we will improve this estimate to

$$\| f \cdot g \,|S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \le c_2 \, \| f \,|S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \, \| g \,|S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \,, \qquad f, g \in S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d) \,,$$

mainly based on improved trace inequalities. It is well-known that the mapping $\mathrm{tr} : \; f(x_1, x_2) \mapsto f(x_1, 0)$ maps $S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^2)$ continuously onto $W_p^m(\mathbb{R})$. Let $d = d_1 + d_2$, $d_1, d_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots \alpha_{d_1}, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$, $\max_\ell |\alpha_\ell| \le m$. We shall show below that in the general d-dimensional context we always have an inequality of the form

$$\| \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2}} |D^\alpha f(x, y)| \,|L_p(\mathbb{R}^{d_1})\| \le c_3 \, \| f \,|S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d)\|$$

with c_3 independent of f.

In a similar way we shall proceed in case of Besov spaces. Let r be a positive real number and $1 \le p \le \infty$. We define

$$S_{p,p}^r B(\mathbb{R}^d) \;\; := \;\; \underbrace{B_{p,p}^r(\mathbb{R}) \otimes_{\alpha_p} B_{p,p}^r(\mathbb{R}) \otimes_{\alpha_p} \dots \otimes_{\alpha_p} B_{p,p}^r(\mathbb{R})}_{\text{d times}} \,.$$

For those tensor product Besov spaces, in case $r > 1/p$, we shall show the inequality

$$\| f \cdot g \,|S_{p,p}^r B(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \le c_4 \, \| f \,|S_{p,p}^r B(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \, \| g \,|S_{p,p}^r B(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \,, \qquad f, g \in S_{p,p}^r B(\mathbb{R}^d) \,, \tag{1.4}$$

In both cases, the Sobolev spaces of dominating mixed smoothness $S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and the Besov spaces of dominating mixed smoothness $S_{p,p}^r B(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we also able to describe the set of all pointwise multipliers $M(S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d))$ and $M(S_{p,p}^r B(\mathbb{R}^d))$, respectively. Our proof of (1.4) relies on the characterization of $S_{p,p}^r B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by differences as in the classical paper [25] of Strichartz or in the monographs [9], [10] by Maz'ya and Shaposnikova. It seems that the method of using paraproducts, already applied in Peetre [17], Triebel [27], [28] or Runst, S. [18], is less convenient in the context

of dominating mixed smoothness.

Probably less well-known is the fact that the intersections $W_p^m(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $B_{p,p}^r(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ form algebras with respect to pointwise multiplication. Here $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $r > 0$. We refer to Moser [11], Zeidler [33, Prop. 21.77] for the Sobolev case with $p = 2$, Peetre [17, Thm. 11, p. 147] for the Besov case and to [18, Thm. 4.6.4/2] for the general situation. In addition the following Moser-type inequalities hold

$$\| f \cdot g \,|W_p^m(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \le c_5 \left(\| f \,|W_p^m(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \, \| g \,|L_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)\| + \| g \,|W_p^m(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \, \| f \,|L_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \right)$$

for all $f, g \in W_p^m(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and

$$\| f \cdot g \,|B_{p,p}^r(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \le c_6 \left(\| f \,|B_{p,p}^r(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \, \| g \,|L_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)\| + \| g \,|B_{p,p}^r(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \, \| f \,|L_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \right)$$

for all $f, g \in B_{p,p}^r(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, respectively.

To our own surprise these inequalities do not have a counterpart in the tensor product situation.

The paper is organized as follows. In the next Section 2 we shall collect all what is needed about these tensor product function spaces. Mainly we shall work with Fourier analytic descriptions and characterizations by differences of these classes. In Section 3 we shall state and comment on our main results. All proofs are concentrated in Section 4.

Notation

As usual $\mathbb{N}$ denotes the natural numbers, $\mathbb{N}_0 = \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, $\mathbb{Z}$ denotes the integers, $\mathbb{R}$ the real numbers, and $\mathbb{C}$ the complex numbers. The letter $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $d > 1$, is always reserved for the underlying dimension in $\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{Z}^d$ etc and by $[d]$ we mean $[d] = \{1, ..., d\}$. If $k = (k_1, ..., k_d) \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$, then we put

$$|k|_1 := k_1 + \ldots + k_d \qquad \text{and} \qquad |k|_\infty := \max_{j=1,\ldots,d} k_j \,.$$

We denote with $\langle x, y \rangle$ or $x \cdot y$ the usual Euclidean inner product in $\mathbb{R}^d$. By $x \diamond y$ we mean

$$x \diamond y = (x_1 y_1, \ldots, x_d y_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d \,.$$

For a subset e of $\{1, 2, \ldots, d\}$ we put

$$\mathbb{N}_0^d(e) := \big\{ k \in \mathbb{N}_0^d : \; k_i = 0 \text{ if } i \notin e \big\}.$$

If X and Y are two (quasi-)normed spaces, the (quasi-)norm of an element x in X will be denoted by $\|x \,|X\|$. The symbol $X \hookrightarrow Y$ indicates that the identity operator is continuous. For two sequences a_n and b_n we will write $a_n \lesssim b_n$ if there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that $a_n \le c\, b_n$ for all n. We will write $a_n \asymp b_n$ if $a_n \lesssim b_n$ and $b_n \lesssim a_n$.

Let $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be the Schwartz space of all complex-valued rapidly decreasing infinitely differentiable functions on $\mathbb{R}^d$. The topological dual, the class of tempered distributions, is denoted by $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$ (equipped with the weak topology). The Fourier transform on $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is given by

$$\mathcal{F}\varphi(\xi) = (2\pi)^{-d/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-ix\xi} \, \varphi(x) \, dx \,, \qquad \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d \,.$$

The inverse transformation is denoted by $\mathcal{F}^{-1}$. We use both notations also for the transformations defined on $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

2 Sobolev and Besov spaces of dominating mixed smoothness

For our methods the tensor product approach to these function spaces is not appropriate. We shall introduce them by derivatives and differences.

2.1 Sobolev spaces of dominating mixed smoothness

The interpretation of Sobolev spaces of dominating mixed smoothness as tensor product spaces is taken from [21, 22]. We refer also to these papers for a definition of $X \otimes_{\alpha_p} Y$. However, here we shall work with the following.

Definition 2.1. *Let $1 < p < \infty$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the Sobolev space of dominating mixed smoothness $S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the collection of all functions $f \in L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that all distributional derivatives $D^\alpha f$ with $\max_{j=1,\dots d} \alpha_j \le m$ belong to $L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$. We put*

$$\| f \,|S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^{(d)} := \sum_{|\alpha|_\infty \le m} \| D^\alpha f \,|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \,.$$

Remark 2.2. Let $1 < p < \infty$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$. By $W_p^m(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we denote the isotropic classical Sobolev spaces equipped with the norm

$$\|f|W_p^m(\mathbb{R}^d)\| := \sum_{|\alpha|_1 \le m} \|D^\alpha f|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \,.$$

$\| \cdot \,|S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d)\|$ is a cross-norm, i.e., if $f_i \in W_p^m(\mathbb{R}),\ i = 1, \dots, d$, then

$$f(x) = \prod_{i=1}^d f_i(x_i) \in S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \| f \,|S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d)\| = \prod_{i=1}^d \| f_i \,|W_p^m(\mathbb{R})\| \,.$$

In case $d = 1$ we have $S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}) = W_p^m(\mathbb{R})$.

As in case of isotropic Sobolev spaces it will be enough to concentrate on the L_p-norms of the function itself and of those derivatives with the highest order, i.e., those derivatives D^α, where $\alpha \in \{0, m\}^d$, see [19] (combine Def. 2.3.1 and Theorem 2.3.1) or [3, Cor. 2.1.1].

Lemma 2.3. *Let $1 < p < \infty$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then $S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the collection of $f \in L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that*

$$\|f|S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^* := \sum_{\alpha \in \{0,m\}^d} \|D^\alpha f|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\| < \infty \,.$$

$\| \cdot \,|S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^*$ and $\| \cdot \,|S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^{(d)}$ are equivalent.

Of some importance will be embeddings into the class $C(\mathbb{R}^d)$ of all bounded and continuous functions equipped with the supremum norm.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $1 < p < \infty$. Then the space $S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is continuously embedded into $C(\mathbb{R}^d)$.*

For a proof we refer to [19, Remark 2.4.1/2].

2.2 Besov spaces of dominating mixed smoothness

Next we shall give the definition of Besov spaces of dominating mixed smoothness. Therefore we use differences. But before doing that we recall the definition of (isotropic) Besov spaces.

For a multivariate function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{C}$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $h \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we put

$$\Delta_h^m f(x) := \sum_{\ell=0}^{m} (-1)^{m-\ell} \binom{m}{\ell} f(x + \ell h)$$

and

$$\omega_m(f,t)_p := \sup_{|h|<t} \| \Delta_h^m f \,|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\|\,, \qquad t > 0\,.$$

Let $1 \le p \le \infty$ and $r > 0$, $m-1 \le r < m$. Then the (isotropic) Besov space $B^r_{p,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is a collection of all $f \in L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that

$$\|f|B^r_{p,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)\| := \| f \,|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\| + \Big(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (2^{jr}\, \omega_m(f, 2^{-j}))^p \Big)^{1/p} < \infty. \tag{2.1}$$

Clearly, in a similar way one could define the more general spaces $B^r_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $1 \le q \le \infty$, however, we will not need them here.

Now we turn to Besov spaces of dominating mixed smoothness. Let $i \in [d]$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $h \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we put

$$\Delta_{h,j}^m f(x) := \sum_{\ell=0}^{m} (-1)^{m-\ell} \binom{m}{\ell} f(x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}, x_j + \ell h, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_d)\,.$$

This is the m-th order difference of f in direction j. For $e \subset [d]$, $h \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$ the mixed (m,e)-th difference operator $\Delta_h^{m,e}$ is defined to be

$$\Delta_h^{m,e} := \prod_{i \in e} \Delta_{h_i,i}^{m_i} \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta_h^{m,\emptyset} := \mathrm{Id}\,,$$

where $\mathrm{Id}\, f = f$. An associated modulus of smoothness is given by

$$\omega_m^e(f,t)_p := \sup_{|h_i|<t_i, i \in e} \| \Delta_h^{m,e} f \,|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \quad , \quad t \in [0,1]^d$$

for $f \in L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ (in particular, $\omega_m^{\emptyset}(f,t)_p = \|f|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\|$). Many times, e.g., in the definition below we do not need to choose m as a vector. For this reason, if $m = (n, \dots, n)$ we put

$$\overline{n} := (n, \dots, n)\,, \qquad n \in \mathbb{N}\,.$$

For a set $e \subset [d]$ we denote

$$\mathbb{N}_0^d(e) = \big\{ k \in \mathbb{N}_0^d : \ k_i = 0 \text{ if } i \notin e \big\}.$$

Let $k \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$. For brevity we write 2^{-k} instead of the vector $(2^{-k_1}, 2^{-k_2}, \dots, 2^{-k_d})$

Definition 2.5. *Let $1 \le p \le \infty$, $r > 0$ and $m-1 \le r < m$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the Besov space of dominating mixed smoothness $S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the collection of all $f \in L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that*

$$\| f \,|S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^{(m)} := \sum_{e \subset [d]} \Big(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0^d(e)} 2^{r|k|_1 p} \omega_{\overline{m}}^e(f, 2^{-k})_p^p \Big)^{1/p}$$

is finite with the usual modification if $p = \infty$.

Remark 2.6. (i) If $d = 1$ we get $S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}) = B^r_{p,p}(\mathbb{R})$.
(ii) Besov spaces of dominating mixed smoothness also have a cross-norm. If $f_i \in B^r_{p,p}(\mathbb{R})$, $i = 1, ..., d$, then its tensor product

$$f(x) := (f_1 \otimes f_2 \otimes \ldots \otimes f_d)(x) = \prod_{i=1}^{d} f_i(x_i)\,, \qquad x = (x_1, \ldots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d\,,$$

belongs to $S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and

$$\| f \,|S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\| = \prod_{i=1}^{d} \| f_i \,|B^r_{p,p}(\mathbb{R})\|\,.$$

(iii) For the interpretation of $S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ as tensor products of $B^r_{p,p}(\mathbb{R})$ we refer to [21, 22].

Next we recall two properties which will be of certain use later on.

Lemma 2.7. *Let $r > 0$ and $1 \le p \le \infty$. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$ such that $r < m_i$ for all $i \in [d]$. Then*

$$\| f \,|S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^{(m)} := \sum_{e \subset [d]} \Big(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0^d(e)} 2^{r|k|_1 p} \omega^e_m(f, 2^{-k})^p_p \Big)^{1/p}$$

is an equivalent norm on the space $S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

For a proof we refer to [19, 2.3.4] ($d = 2$) and [29].

Lemma 2.8. *Let $r > 0$ and $1 \le p \le \infty$. Then the space $S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is continuously embedded into $C(\mathbb{R}^d)$ if and only if either $r > 1/p$ or $r = 1 = p$.*

For a proof we refer to [19, 2.3.4] ($d = 2$) and [32].

2.3 Tools from Fourier analysis

Littlewood-Paley characterizations will play an important role in our investigations.
Let $\varphi_0 \in C^\infty_0(\mathbb{R})$ be a non-negative function such that $\varphi_0(\xi) = 1$ on $[-1, 1]$ and $\operatorname{supp} \varphi_0 \subset [-\frac{3}{2}, \frac{3}{2}]$. For $j \in \mathbb{N}$ we define

$$\varphi_j(\xi) = \varphi_0(2^{-j}\xi) - \varphi_0(2^{-j+1}\xi), \qquad \xi \in \mathbb{R}\,,$$

and

$$\varphi_k(x) := \varphi_{k_1}(x_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \varphi_{k_d}(x_d)\,, \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_0^d\,.$$

This implies

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0^d} \varphi_k(x) &= 1 \qquad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^d\,, \\ \operatorname{supp} \varphi_k &\subset \Big\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d : 2^{k_\ell - 1} \le |x_\ell| \le 3\, 2^{k_\ell - 1}\,, \quad \ell = 1, \ldots, d \Big\}\,. \end{aligned}$$

We shall call the system $\{\varphi_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0^d}$ a smooth dyadic decomposition of unity on $\mathbb{R}^d$. Let χ_0 be the characteristic function of $[-1, 1]$. Let further χ_j, $j \in \mathbb{N}$, be the characteristic function of $[-2^j, -2^{j-1}) \cup (2^{j-1}, 2^j]$. For $k \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$ we define $\chi_k(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, as a tensor product, i.e.,

$$\chi_k(x) := \chi_{k_1}(x_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \chi_{k_d}(x_d)\,, \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_0^d\,. \tag{2.2}$$

The system $\{\chi_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0^d}$ represents a nonsmooth dyadic decomposition of unity on $\mathbb{R}^d$.

Proposition 2.9. *Let $\{\varphi_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0^d}$ be the above system.*
(i) Let $1 < p < \infty$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then $S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the collection of all tempered distributions $f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that

$$\| f \, | S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d) \|^\varphi := \Big\| \Big(\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0^d} 2^{2|k|_1 m} \, \big| \, \mathcal{F}^{-1}[\varphi_k \, \mathcal{F} f](\,\cdot\,) \big|^2 \Big)^{1/2} \Big| L_p(\mathbb{R}^d) \Big\| < \infty.$$

(ii) Let $1 \le p \le \infty$ and $r > 0$. Then $S_{p,p}^r B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the collection of all tempered distributions $f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that

$$\| f \, | S_{p,p}^r B(\mathbb{R}^d) \|^\varphi := \Big(\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0^d} 2^{r|k|_1 p} \, \| \, \mathcal{F}^{-1}[\varphi_k \, \mathcal{F} f] | L_p(\mathbb{R}^d) \|^p \Big)^{1/p} < \infty.$$

(iii) If we replace the smooth system $\{\varphi_k\}_k$ by the nonsmooth $\{\chi_k\}_k$ in (i) and (ii) then we obtain equivalent norms in case $1 < p < \infty$ in the corresponding spaces.

Remark 2.10. Concerning a proof of part (i) we refer to [19, Theorem 2.3.1]. For $m = 0$ part (i) is just a variant of the Littlewood-Paley assertions, see, e.g., Lizorkin [6, 7] or Nikol'skij [12, 1.5.6]. The proof of Proposition 2.9(ii) can be found in [19, 2.3.3, 2.3.4] and [29], see also [13]. The proof of (iii) is a straightforward modification of a similar assertion in the isotropic case, called Lizorkin representations. We refer to Lizorkin [5] and [28, 2.5.4].

Next we will collect some required tools from Fourier analysis. We recall an adapted version of the famous Nikolskij inequality, see Uninskij [30, 31], Stöckert [24] or [19, Theorem 1.6.2].

Proposition 2.11. *Let $0 < p_0 \le p \le \infty$ and $\alpha = (\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_d) \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$. Let $\Omega = [-b_1, b_1] \times \cdots \times [-b_d, b_d]$, $b_i > 0$, $i = 1, ..., d$. Then there exists a positive constant C, independent of $(b_1, \ldots, b_d)$, such that*

$$\|D^\alpha f | L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \le C \Big(\prod_{i=1}^d b_i^{\alpha_i + \frac{1}{p_0} - \frac{1}{p}} \Big) \|f | L_{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^d)\|$$

holds for all $f \in L_{p_0}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\operatorname{supp} \mathcal{F} f \subset \Omega$.

The following construction of a maximal function is essentially due to Peetre, but based on earlier work of Fefferman and Stein. Let $a > 0$ and $b = (b_1, ..., b_d)$, $b_i > 0$, $i = 1, ..., d$ be fixed. Let f be a regular distribution such that $\mathcal{F} f$ is compactly supported. We define the Peetre maximal function $P_{b,a} f$ by

$$P_{b,a} f(x) = \sup_{z\in\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|f(x-z)|}{\prod_{i=1}^d (1 + |b_i z_i|)^a}, \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Proposition 2.12. *Let $1 \le p \le \infty$ and $\Omega = [-b_1, b_1] \times \cdots \times [-b_d, b_d]$, $b_i > 0$, $i = 1, ..., d$. Let further $a > 1/p$. Then there exists a positive constant C, independent of $(b_1, \ldots, b_d)$, such that*

$$\big\| P_{b,a} f \big| L_p(\mathbb{R}^d) \big\| \le C \, \|f | L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\|$$

holds for all $f \in L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{F} f) \subset \Omega$.

For a proof we refer to [28, Thm. 1.6.2]. A very useful relation between Peetre maximal function and differences is given by the following lemma, see [29] and [19, 2.3.3] (two-dimensional case).

Lemma 2.13. *Let $a > 0$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then there exists a constant C such that*

$$|\Delta_h^m f(t)| \le C \, \max\{1, |bh|^a\} \, \min\{1, |bh|^m\} \, P_{b,a} f(t) \, .$$

holds for all $b \ge 1$, all $h \neq 0$, all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$ satisfying $\operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{F}f) \subset [-b, b]$.

Applying the above result iteratively with respect to components in $e \subset [d]$ we get the following modified version in multivariate situation.

Lemma 2.14. *Let $a > 0$, $e \subset [d]$, $m \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$ and $h = (h_1, ..., h_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Let further $f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with* $\operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{F}f) \subset Q_b$, *where*

$$Q_b := [-b_1, b_1] \times ... \times [-b_d, b_d] \, , \quad b_i > 0, \quad i = 1, ..., d.$$

Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ (independent of f, b, x and h) such that

$$|\Delta_h^{m,e} f(x)| \le C \left(\prod_{i \in e} \max\{1, |b_i h_i|^a\} \, \min\{1, |b_i h_i|^{m_i}\} \right) P_{b,a} f(x)$$

holds for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Finally, we recall a Fourier multiplier assertion for vector-valued L_p-spaces of entire analytic function, see [3, Proposition 2.3.5] or [19, Theorem 1.10.3] (two-dimensional case).

Lemma 2.15. *Let $0 < p < \infty$ and $\Omega = \{\Omega_\ell\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0^d}$ be a sequence of compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}^d$ given by*

$$\Omega_\ell = [-b_1^\ell, b_1^\ell] \times \cdots \times [-b_d^\ell, b_d^\ell] \, .$$

Let $r > \frac{1}{\min(p,2)} + \frac{1}{2}$, $r \in \mathbb{N}$. Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\left\| \Big(\sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0^d} \left| \mathcal{F}^{-1} M_\ell \mathcal{F} f_\ell \right|^2 \Big)^{1/2} \, \Big| \, L_p(\mathbb{R}^d) \right\| \le C \sup_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0^d} \| M_\ell(b^\ell \cdot) | S_2^r W(\mathbb{R}^d) \| \left\| \Big(\sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0^d} \left| f_\ell \right|^2 \Big)^{1/2} \, \Big| \, L_p(\mathbb{R}^d) \right\|$$

holds for all systems $\{f_\ell\}_\ell$, satisfying $\left(\sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0^d} \left| f_\ell \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \in L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{F}f_\ell) \subset \Omega_\ell$, $\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$, *and all systems $\{M_\ell\}_\ell \in S_2^r W(\mathbb{R}^d)$.*

3 Main results

For a Banach space X of functions we shall call a function f a pointwise multiplier if $f \cdot g \in X$ for all $g \in X$ (this is includes, of course, that the operation $g \mapsto f \cdot g$ must be well defined for all $g \in X$). If $X \hookrightarrow L_p(\Omega)$ for some p (here Ω is a domain in $\mathbb{R}^d$), as a consequence of the Closed Graph Theorem, we obtain that the liner operator $T_f : \; g \mapsto f \cdot g$, associated to such a pointwise multiplier, must be continuous in X, see [10, p. 33]. We shall call X an algebra with respect to pointwise multiplication (for short a multiplication algebra) if $f \cdot g \in X$ for all $f, g \in X$. In addition we put

$$M(X) := \Big\{ f : \; f \cdot g \in X \qquad \forall g \in X \Big\}$$

and equip this set with the norm of the operator T_f, i.e.,

$$\| f \, | M(X) \| := \| \, T_f : \; X \to X \| = \sup_{\| g | X \| \le 1} \| \, f \cdot g \, | X \| \, .$$

3.1 Pointwise multipliers for Sobolev spaces

One of our main results is as follows.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $1 < p < \infty$. Then $S^m_p W(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is a multiplication algebra.*

Remark 3.2. For the isotropic case we refer to Moser [11], Strichartz [25] and the comprehensive monographs [9], [10] of Maz'ya and Shaposnikova.

One way to extend this result to $p = \infty$ is given by considering $C^m_{\rm mix}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ instead of $S^m_\infty W(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Definition 3.3. *Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $C^m_{\rm mix}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the collection of all continuous functions $f : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{C}$ such that all derivatives $D^\alpha f$ with $\max_{j=1,\dots d} \alpha_j \le m$ are continuous as well and*

$$\| f \,|C^m_{\rm mix}(\mathbb{R}^d)\| := \sum_{|\alpha|_\infty \le m} \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d} |\, D^\alpha f(x)\,| < \infty\,.$$

In this case the following result is almost trivial.

Theorem 3.4. *Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $C^m_{\rm mix}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is a multiplication algebra.*

We continue with a comment to Moser-type inequalities. Let $d = 2$. Then, for $\alpha = (m, m)$ we obtain

$$D^\alpha(f\,\cdot\, g)(x,y) = \sum_{j=0}^m \binom{m}{j} \sum_{\ell=0}^m \binom{m}{\ell} \frac{\partial^{j+\ell} f}{\partial x^\ell\, \partial y^j}(x,y)\, \frac{\partial^{2m-(j+\ell)} g}{\partial x^{m-\ell}\, \partial y^{m-j}}(x,y)\,. \tag{3.1}$$

By choosing $j = 0$ and $\ell = m$ we see that the term $\frac{\partial^m f}{\partial x^m}\,\frac{\partial^m g}{\partial y^m}$ occurs in the previous sum. Hence, Gagliardo-Nirenberg-type inequalities can not be applied as it is done in the isotropic case. This is the main reason why we can not expect Moser-type inequalities for the dominating mixed case.

Theorem 3.5. *Let $d > 1$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$.*
(i) *Then there exists no constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\| f\,\cdot\, g\,|C^m_{\rm mix}(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \le C\,\big(\| f\,|C^m_{\rm mix}(\mathbb{R}^d)\|\cdot\| g\,|L_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)\| + \| f\,|L_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)\|\cdot\|g|C^m_{\rm mix}(\mathbb{R}^d)\|\big)$$

holds for all $f, g \in C^m_{\rm mix}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.
(ii) *Let $1 < p < \infty$. There exists no constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\|fg|S^m_p W(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \le C\big(\|f|S^m_p W(\mathbb{R}^d)\|\cdot\|g|L_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)\| + \|f|L_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)\|\cdot\|g|S^m_p W(\mathbb{R}^d)\|\big)$$

holds for all $f, g \in S^m_p W(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Based on Theorems 3.1, 3.4 it is quite easy to get a characterization of $M(S^m_p W(\mathbb{R}^d))$ and $M(C^m_{\rm mix}(\mathbb{R}^d))$.

Let ψ be a non-negative $C^\infty_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$ function. We put $\psi_\mu(x) = \psi(x-\mu)$, $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and assume that

$$\sum_{\mu\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \psi_\mu(x) = 1 \qquad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^d\,. \tag{3.2}$$

Definition 3.6. *Let the Banach space X be continuously embedded into $L^{\ell oc}_1(\mathbb{R}^d)$.*
(i) *$X^{\ell oc}$ is the collection of all $g \in L^{\ell oc}_1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\varphi\cdot g \in X$ for all test functions $\varphi \in C^\infty_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$.*
(ii) *Let ψ be as in (3.2). Then $X_{\rm unif}$ is the collection of all $f \in X^{\ell oc}$ such that*

$$\| f\,|X_{\rm unif}\|_\psi = \sup_{\mu\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \| \psi_\mu\,\cdot\, f\,|X\| < \infty.$$

Remark 3.7. The spaces $S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d)_{\rm unif}$ and $S_{p,p}^r B(\mathbb{R}^d)_{\rm unif}$ are independent of the special choice of ψ (in the sense of equivalent norms). These are consequences of Theorem 3.4 and Theorem 3.10 respectively.

Now we are in position to formulate the main result of our paper.

Theorem 3.8. *Let $d > 1$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$.*
(i) *Let $1 < p < \infty$. We have*

$$M(S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d)) = S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d)_{\rm unif}$$

in the sense of equivalent norms.
(ii) *We have*

$$M(C_{\rm mix}^m(\mathbb{R}^d)) = C_{\rm mix}^m(\mathbb{R}^d)$$

in the sense of equivalent norms.

Remark 3.9. For the classical case of isotropic Sobolev spaces we refer again to Strichartz [25] and the monographs [9], [10] of Maz'ya and Shaposnikova.

3.2 Pointwise multipliers for Besov spaces

The main result with respect to Besov spaces of dominating mixed smoothness reads as follows.

Theorem 3.10. *Let $1 \le p \le \infty$ and $r > 0$. Then $S_{p,p}^r B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is a multiplication algebra if and only if either $1 < p \le \infty$ and $r > 1/p$ or $p = 1$ and $r \ge 1$.*

Remark 3.11. There is a rather long list of references concerning the isotropic case. Let us refer to Peetre [17], Triebel [27], Maz'ya, Shaposnikova [9], [10] and Runst, S. [18] to mention at least a few.

Based on Theorem 3.10 it is now quite easy to prove the following.

Theorem 3.12. *Let either $1 < p \le \infty$ and $r > 1/p$ or $p = 1$ and $r \ge 1$. Then*

$$M(S_{p,p}^r B(\mathbb{R}^d)) = S_{p,p}^r B(\mathbb{R}^d)_{\rm unif}$$

holds in the sense of equivalent norms.

Also in case of Besov spaces of dominating mixed smoothness there is no hope for Moser-type inequalities.

Theorem 3.13. *Let $d > 1$, $1 \le p \le \infty$ and $r > 0$. Then there exists no constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\|fg|S_{p,p}^r B(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \le C \left(\|f|S_{p,p}^r B(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \cdot \|g|L_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)\| + \|f|L_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \cdot \|g|S_{p,p}^r B(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \right)$$

holds for all $f, g \in S_{p,p}^r B(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

3.3 Pointwise multipliers for Sobolev-Besov spaces defined on domains

As a service for the reader we investigate the local situation as well, i.e., we consider pointwise multipliers for Sobolev and Besov spaces defined on the unit cube $\Omega = [0,1]^d$. For convenience we introduce the spaces under consideration by taking restrictions.

Definition 3.14. (i) *Let $1 < p < \infty$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $S_p^m W(\Omega)$ is the space of all $f \in L_p(\Omega)$ such that there exists $g \in S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying $f = g|_\Omega$. It is endowed with the quotient norm*

$$\| f \, | S_p^m W(\Omega) \| = \inf \left\{ \| g | S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d) \| \ : \ g|_\Omega = f \right\}.$$

(ii) *Let $1 \le p \le \infty$ and $r > 0$. Then $S_{p,p}^r B(\Omega)$ is the space of all $f \in L_p(\Omega)$ such that there exists $g \in S_{p,q}^r B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying $f = g|_\Omega$. It is endowed with the quotient norm*

$$\| f \, | S_{p,p}^r B(\Omega) \| = \inf \left\{ \| g | S_{p,p}^r B(\mathbb{R}^d) \| \ : \ g|_\Omega = f \right\}.$$

We have the following lemma.

Lemma 3.15. *Let $1 < p < \infty$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $S_p^m W(\Omega)$ is the collection of $f \in L_p(\Omega)$ such that*

$$\| f | S_p^m W(\Omega) \| := \sum_{|\alpha|_\infty \le m} \| D^\alpha f | L_p(\Omega) \| < \infty \,, \ \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^d \,.$$

Our main results obtained in the previous subsections carry over to the local case.

Theorem 3.16. (i) *Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $1 < p < \infty$. Then $S_p^m W(\Omega)$ is a multiplication algebra.*
(ii) *Let $1 \le p \le \infty$ and $r > 0$. Then $S_{p,p}^r B(\Omega)$ is a multiplication algebra if and only if either $1 < p \le \infty$ and $r > 1/p$ or $p = 1$ and $r \ge 1$.*

Similar as in the global case Thm. 3.16 can be turned into a characterizations of $M(S_p^m W(\Omega))$ and $M(S_{p,p}^r B(\Omega))$, respectively.

Theorem 3.17. (i) *Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $1 < p < \infty$. Then*

$$M(S_p^m W(\Omega)) = S_p^m W(\Omega))$$

holds in the sense of equivalent norms.
(ii) *Let either $1 < p \le \infty$ and $r > 1/p$ or $p = 1$ and $r \ge 1$. Then*

$$M(S_{p,p}^r B(\Omega)) = S_{p,p}^r B(\Omega)$$

holds in the sense of equivalent norms.

Also in the local situation a Moser-type inequality does not hold.

Theorem 3.18. *Let $d > 1$.*
(i) *Let $1 < p < \infty$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$. There exists no constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\| f \cdot g | S_p^m W(\Omega) \| \le C \big(\| f | S_p^m W(\Omega) \| \cdot \| g | L_\infty(\Omega) \| + \| f | L_\infty(\Omega) \| \cdot \| g | S_p^m W(\Omega) \| \big)$$

holds for all $f, g \in S_p^m W(\Omega)$.

(ii) *Let $1 \le p \le \infty$ and $r > 0$. Then there exists no constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\| f \cdot g | S_{p,p}^r B(\Omega) \| \le C \left(\| f | S_{p,p}^r B(\Omega) \| \cdot \| g | L_\infty(\Omega) \| + \| f | L_\infty(\Omega) \| \cdot \| g | S_{p,p}^r B(\Omega) \| \right)$$

holds for all $f, g \in S_{p,p}^r B(\Omega) \cap L_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

4 Proofs

4.1 Proof of the results in Subsection 3.1

To prepare the proof of Theorem 3.1 we need the following lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $1 < p < \infty$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$ such that there exists some $L \in \mathbb{N}$, $L < d$, and $\beta = (m, m, \dots, m, \beta_{L+1}, \dots, \beta_d)$ where $\max_{j=L+1,\dots,d} \beta_j < m$. Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $L \le N \le d$. Then there exists a constant C such that*

$$\Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \sup_{x_{N+1},\dots,x_d \in \mathbb{R}} |D^\beta f(x)|^p \prod_{j=1}^N dx_j \Big)^{1/p} \le C \, \| \, f \, | S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d) \|$$

holds for all $f \in S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Proof. Using the density of functions with compactly supported Fourier transform in $S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d)$ (which is a consequence of Proposition 2.9) we may assume that $\operatorname{supp} \mathcal{F} f$ is compact. Let $(\chi_k)_k$ be the non-smooth decomposition of unity defined in (2.2). It follows

$$f(x) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0^d} \mathcal{F}^{-1}[\chi_k \mathcal{F} f](x) \,, \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{4.1}$$

where the sum on the right-hand side of (4.1) has only a finite number of nontrivial terms. Consequently we have

$$D^\beta f(x) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0^d} \mathcal{F}^{-1}[\chi_k \mathcal{F} D^\beta f](x) \,, \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Let $\mathcal{F}_n$ denote the Fourier transform on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Freezing $x_1, \dots, x_N$ and choosing $n = d - N$ we get as above

$$D^\beta f(x) = \sum_{k_{N+1},\dots,k_d \in \mathbb{N}_0} \mathcal{F}_n^{-1}[\chi_{k_{N+1}} \otimes \dots \otimes \chi_{k_d} \mathcal{F}_n D^\beta f](x) \,, \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

By making use of this identity, triangle inequality and the Nikol'skij inequality, stated in Proposition 2.11, we conlude

$$\begin{aligned} I := \; & \Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \sup_{x_{N+1},\dots,x_d \in \mathbb{R}} |D^\beta f(x)|^p \prod_{j=1}^N dx_j \Big)^{1/p} \\ \le \; & \sum_{k_{N+1},\dots,k_d \in \mathbb{N}_0} \Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \sup_{x_{N+1},\dots,x_d \in \mathbb{R}} \Big| \mathcal{F}_n^{-1}[\chi_{k_{N+1}} \otimes \dots \otimes \chi_{k_d} \mathcal{F}_n D^\beta f](x) \Big|^p \prod_{j=1}^N dx_j \Big)^{1/p} \\ \le \; & c_1 \sum_{k_{N+1},\dots,k_d \in \mathbb{N}_0} \Big(\prod_{j=N+1}^d 2^{\frac{k_j}{p}} \Big) \Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Big| \mathcal{F}_n^{-1}[\chi_{k_{N+1}} \otimes \dots \otimes \chi_{k_d} \mathcal{F}_n D^\beta f](x) \Big|^p dx \Big)^{1/p}. \end{aligned}$$

The Littlewood-Paley assertion, see Proposition 2.9, implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \Big| \mathcal{F}_n^{-1}[\chi_{k_{N+1}} \otimes \dots \otimes \chi_{k_d} \mathcal{F}_n D^\beta f](x) \Big|^p \prod_{j=1}^N dx_j \Big)^{1/p} \\ \le \; & c_2 \Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \Big(\sum_{k_1,\dots,k_N \in \mathbb{N}_0} \Big| \mathcal{F}^{-1}[\chi_{k_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \chi_{k_d} \mathcal{F} D^\beta f](x) \Big|^2 \Big)^{p/2} \prod_{j=N+1}^d dx_j \Big)^{1/p} \end{aligned}$$

We define a multi-index α by taking $\alpha+\beta=(m,\dots,m)$. Inserting this inequality in the previously obtained one we find

$$\begin{aligned} I &\le c_3 \sum_{k_{N+1},\dots,k_d\in\mathbb{N}_0} \Big(\prod_{j=N+1}^{d} 2^{\frac{k_j}{p}}\Big) \Big\| \Big(\sum_{k_1,\dots,k_N\in\mathbb{N}_0} \big|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\big[\chi_k \mathcal{F} D^\beta f\big]\big|^2 \Big)^{1/2} \Big| L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\Big\| \\ &= c_3 \sum_{k_{N+1},\dots,k_d\in\mathbb{N}_0} \Big(\prod_{j=N+1}^{d} 2^{k_j(\frac{1}{p}-\alpha_j)}\Big) \\ &\quad \times \Big\| \Big(\sum_{k_1,\dots,k_N\in\mathbb{N}_0} \Big(\prod_{j=N+1}^{d} 2^{2k_j\alpha_j}\Big) \big|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\big[\chi_k \mathcal{F} D^\beta f\big]\big|^2 \Big\}^{1/2} \Big| L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\Big\| \\ &\le c_4 \Big\| \Big\{ \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0^d} \Big(\prod_{j=N+1}^{d} 2^{2k_j\alpha_j}\Big) \big|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\Big[\chi_k \mathcal{F} D^\beta f\Big]\big|^2 \Big\}^{1/2} \Big| L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\Big\|, \end{aligned}$$

where we used

$$\alpha_j \ge 1 > \frac{1}{p}, \qquad j=N+1,\dots d.$$

Let $\phi_0,\phi\in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ be functions such that

$$\phi_0(\xi)=1 \quad \text{on} \quad [-1,1] \qquad \text{and} \qquad \phi(\xi)=1 \quad \text{on} \quad \operatorname{supp}(\chi_1).$$

For $j\in\mathbb{N}$ we put $\phi_j(\xi):=\phi(2^{-j+1}t)$ and $\phi_k:=\phi_{k_1}\otimes\dots\otimes\phi_{k_d}$ if $k\in\mathbb{N}_0^d$. Then it follows

$$\begin{aligned} &\Big\| \Big\{ \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0^d} \Big(\prod_{j=N+1}^{d} 2^{2k_j\alpha_j}\Big) \Big|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\Big[\chi_k(\xi)\,\phi_k(\xi)\,\xi^\beta\,\mathcal{F}f(\xi)\Big](\,\cdot\,)\Big|^2 \Big\}^{1/2} \Big| L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\Big\| \\ &\qquad = \Big\| \Big\{ \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0^d} 2^{2|k|_1 m} \Big|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\Big[\chi_k\, M_k\, \mathcal{F}f\Big]\Big|^2 \Big\}^{1/2} \Big| L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\Big\|, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$M_k(\xi) := \phi_k(\xi) \Big(\prod_{j=1}^{N} 2^{-k_j m}\xi_j^{\beta_j}\Big) \Big(\prod_{j=N+1}^{d} 2^{k_j(\alpha_j-m)}\xi_j^{\beta_j}\Big).$$

Observe that in case $k_j\ge 1$, $j=1,\dots d$, we have

$$\|\, M_k(2^k\,\cdot\,)\,|S_p^r W(\mathbb{R}^d)\| = \Big(\prod_{j=1}^{N} 2^{k_j(\beta_j-m)}\Big) \Big(\prod_{j=N+1}^{d} 2^{k_j(\alpha_j+\beta_j-m)}\Big) \Big\| \phi_1(2\xi)\,\xi^\beta \Big| S_p^r W(\mathbb{R}^d)\Big\| < \infty$$

for any $r>0$. For the remaining k a more or less obvious modification can be applied. Hence we find

$$\sup_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0^d} \|\, M_k(2^k\,\cdot\,)\,|S_p^r W(\mathbb{R}^d)\| < \infty$$

since

$$|\beta|_\infty \le m \qquad \text{and} \qquad \alpha_j+\beta_j\le m\,, \quad j=N+1,\dots,d.$$

But this is guaranteed by our assumptions. Now Lemma 2.15 yields

$$I \lesssim \Big\| \Big(\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0^d} 2^{2|k|_1 m} \big|\mathcal{F}^{-1}\chi_k \mathcal{F} f\big|^2 \Big)^{1/2} \Big| L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\Big\|$$

which completes the proof. ∎

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Let $f, g \in S^m_p W(\mathbb{R}^d)$. We shall use the norm given in Lemma 2.3

$$\|f \cdot g|S^m_p W(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^* := \sum_{\gamma\in\{0,m\}^d} \|D^\gamma(f \cdot g)|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\|.$$

Using the density of functions with compactly supported Fourier transform in $S^m_p W(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we may assume that f and g are C^∞ functions. Leibniz rule yields

$$D^\gamma(f \cdot g)(x) = \sum_{\beta\in\mathbb{N}^d_0:\ 0\le\beta\le\gamma} \binom{\gamma}{\beta} D^\beta f(x)\, D^{\gamma-\beta} g(x)\,.$$

Let us assume $|\beta|_\infty < m$. Then from the definition of $S^m_p W(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we derive $D^\beta f \in S^{m-|\beta|_\infty}_p W(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and Lemma 2.4 we conclude $S^{m-|\beta|_\infty}_p W(\mathbb{R}^d) \hookrightarrow C(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\, D^\beta f\, D^{\gamma-\beta} g\,|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\| &\le \|\, D^\beta f\,|C(\mathbb{R}^d)\|\, \|D^{\gamma-\beta} g\,|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \\
&\le c_1\, \|\, D^\beta f\,|S^{m-|\beta|_\infty}_p W(\mathbb{R}^d)\|\, \|\, g\,|S^m_p W(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \\
&\le c_1\, \|\, f\,|S^m_p W(\mathbb{R}^d)\|\, \|\, g\,|S^m_p W(\mathbb{R}^d)\|\,,
\end{aligned}$$

where $c_1 := \|Id :\ S^{m-|\beta|}_p W(\mathbb{R}^d) \to C(\mathbb{R}^d)\|$. Of course, a similar argument can be applied if $|\gamma-\beta|_\infty < m$. It remains to deal with the situation $|\beta|_\infty = |\gamma-\beta|_\infty = m$. Without loss of generality we assume $\beta = (m, \dots, m, \beta_{L+1}, \dots, \beta_N, 0, \dots, 0)$ for some $L, N \in \mathbb{N}$ and

$$0 < \beta_j < m\,, \qquad L+1 \le j \le N\,.$$

But now we can use Lemma 4.1 and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|D^\beta f \cdot D^{\gamma-\beta} g\,|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \\
\le\ & \Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \sup_{x_{N+1},\dots,x_d\in\mathbb{R}} |D^\beta f(x)|^p \prod_{j=1}^N dx_j\Big)^{1/p} \Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-N}} \sup_{x_1,\dots,x_N\in\mathbb{R}} |D^{\gamma-\beta} g(x)|^p \prod_{j=N+1}^d dx_j\Big)^{1/p} \\
\le\ & C^2\, \|\, f\,|S^m_p W(\mathbb{R}^d)\|\, \|\, g\,|S^m_p W(\mathbb{R}^d)\|
\end{aligned}$$

which proves the claim. ∎

Proof of Theorem 3.5. Here we can work with the same test functions as in proof of Theorem 3.13 below. Since the B-case is a bit more complicated we give details in this situation. ∎

Proof of Theorem 3.8. Let further ψ be the function as in the Definition 3.6. Also Sobolev spaces of dominating mixed smoothness satisfy a localization property of the following form: it holds

$$\|f|S^m_p W(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \asymp \Big(\sum_{\mu\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \|\psi_\mu f|S^m_p W(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^p\Big)^{1/p}.$$

Here $1 < p < \infty$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ (we identify $S^0_p W$ with L_p). Let $\phi \in C^\infty_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\phi \equiv 1$ on support of ψ. Let $f \in S^m_p W(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $g \in S^m_p W(\mathbb{R}^d)_{\rm unif}$. Employing this localization principle and Theorem 3.1 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|f \cdot g|S^m_p W(\mathbb{R}^d)\| &\le c_1 \Big(\sum_{\mu\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \|\psi_\mu \phi_\mu g f|S^m_p W(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^p\Big)^{1/p} \\
&\le c_2 \Big(\sum_{\mu\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \|\psi_\mu f|S^m_p W(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^p \cdot \|\phi_\mu g|S^m_p W(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^p\Big)^{1/p} \\
&\le c_3\, \|f|S^m_p W(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \cdot \sup_{\mu\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \|\phi_\mu g|S^m_p W(\mathbb{R}^d)\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Since cardinality of the set $D_\mu := \{\nu \in \mathbb{Z}^d : \operatorname{supp}\phi_\mu \cap \psi_\nu \neq \emptyset\}$ is finite and independent of μ, from Theorem 3.1 we obtain

$$\|\phi_\mu g|S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d)\| = \Big\|\phi_\mu g\Big(\sum_{\nu\in D_\mu}\psi_\nu\Big)\Big|S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d)\Big\| \;\le\; c\sup_{\nu\in\mathbb{Z}^d}\|\psi_\nu g|S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d)\|$$

which implies

$$\|f\cdot g|S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \;\le\; c_4\,\|f|S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d)\|\cdot\sup_{\mu\in\mathbb{Z}^d}\|\psi_\mu g|S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d)\|.$$

Hence,

$$S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d)_{\rm unif} \hookrightarrow M(S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d)).$$

On the other hand, with $g \in M(S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d))$, we derive

$$\begin{aligned}\|\psi_\mu g|S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d)\| &\le \|g|M(S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d))\|\cdot\|\psi_\mu|S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d)\|\\ &= \|g|M(S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d))\|\cdot\|\psi|S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d)\|.\end{aligned}$$

Consequently

$$M(S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d)) \hookrightarrow S_p^m W(\mathbb{R}^d)_{\rm unif}$$

which completes the proof. ■

4.2 Proof of the results in Section 3.2

Proof of Theorem 3.10. *Step 1.* Let $r < m \le r+1$. Since the norm $\|\cdot|\,S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^{(m)}$ does not depend on $m > r$ in the sense of equivalent norms, see Lemma 2.7, we shall prove that

$$\|f\cdot g\,|\,S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^{(2m)} \le C\,\|f|S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\|\cdot\|g|S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\|$$

holds for all $f, g \in S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Taking into account Lemma 2.8 we obtain

$$\|f\cdot g\,|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \;\le\; \|f|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\|\cdot\|g|C(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \;\le\; \|f|S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\|\cdot\|g|S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\|.$$

This inequality can be interpreted as the estimate needed for the term with $e = \emptyset$. Next we need some identities for differences. Note that if $\psi,\ \phi:\ \mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{C}$ and $m\in\mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\Delta_h^m(\psi\phi)(x) = \sum_{j=0}^m \binom{m}{j}\Delta_h^{m-j}\psi(x+jh)\,\Delta_h^j\phi(x), \qquad x,h\in\mathbb{R}\,, \tag{4.2}$$

which can be proved by induction on m. Let $e\subset[d]$, $e\neq\emptyset$ and recall the notation

$$x\diamond y = (x_1\cdot y_1,\dots,x_d\cdot y_d)\in\mathbb{R}^d$$

and

$$\mathbb{N}_0^d(e) = \big\{k\in\mathbb{N}_0^d:\ k_i = 0 \text{ if } i\notin e\big\}.$$

Then we derive from (4.2) that

$$\Delta_h^{2\bar m,e}(f\cdot g)(x) = \sum_{u\in\mathbb{N}_0^d(e),\,|u|_\infty\le 2m}\binom{2\bar m}{u}\Delta_h^{2\bar m-u,e}f(x+u\diamond h)\Delta_h^{u,e}g(x)\,, \quad x,h\in\mathbb{R}^d\,, \tag{4.3}$$

holds. Here $2\bar{m}-u:=(2m-u_1,...,2m-u_d)$ and

$$\binom{2\bar{m}}{u}=\prod_{i\in e}\binom{2m}{u_i}.$$

The main step of the proof will consists in estimating the terms

$$S_{e,u}:=\Big\{\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0^d(e)}2^{r|k|_1p}\Big(\sup_{|h_i|<2^{-k_i},i\in e}\big\|\Delta_h^{2m-u,e}f(\cdot+u\diamond h)\Delta_h^{u,e}g(\cdot)|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\big\|\Big)^p\Big\}^{1/p}$$

$e\neq\emptyset$, $u\in\mathbb{N}_0^d(e)$, $|u|_\infty\le 2m$, by considering some different cases.
Step 2. The case $u_i\le m$ for all $i\in e$. Obviously we have

$$2m-u_i\ge m\,,\qquad i\in e\,.$$

Using a change of variables in the L_p-integral we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\big\|\Delta_h^{2\bar{m}-u,e}f(\cdot+u\diamond h)\Delta_h^{u,e}g(\cdot)|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\big\| &\le \big\|\Delta_h^{2\bar{m}-u,e}f(\cdot+u\diamond h)|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\big\|\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d}|\Delta_h^{u,e}g(x)|\\ &\le c_1\|g|C(\mathbb{R}^d)\|\,\big\|\Delta_h^{\bar{m},e}f(\cdot)|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\big\|\,.\end{aligned}$$

The embedding $S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\hookrightarrow C(\mathbb{R}^d)$ implies

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{|h_i|<2^{-k_i},i\in e}\big\|\Delta_h^{2\bar{m}-u,e}f(\cdot+u\diamond h)\Delta_h^{u,e}\,g(\cdot)\,|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\big\| &\le c_1\,\big\|g|C(\mathbb{R}^d)\big\|\,\omega^e_{\bar{m}}(f,2^{-k})_p\\ &\le c_2\,\big\|g|S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\big\|\,\omega^e_{\bar{m}}(f,2^{-k})_p\,.\end{aligned}$$

Consequently we have

$$\begin{aligned}S_{e,u} &\le c_2\,\big\|g|S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\big\|\,\Big(\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0^d(e)}2^{r|k|_1p}\,\omega^e_{\bar{m}}(f,2^{-k})_p^p\Big)^{1/p}\\ &\le c_2\,\big\|g|S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\big\|\,\big\|f|S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\big\|\,.\end{aligned}$$

The case $u_i\ge m$ for all $i\in e$ can be handled in the same way by interchanging the roles of f and g.
Step 3. The remaining cases. Let there exist $L,N\in\mathbb{N}$ such that $e=\{1,2,\dots,N\}$, $u\in\mathbb{N}_0^d(e)$ and

$$u:=(u_1,\dots u_L,u_{L+1},...,u_N,0,\dots,0)$$

with

$$m\le u_i\le 2m\,,\quad i=1,\dots,L,\qquad 0\le u_i<m,\quad i=L+1,\dots,N,$$

and $L<N\le d$. By assuming $|u|_\infty>m$ we cover all remaining cases up to an enumeration.
Substep 3.1. Let $r>1/p$. Working with the tensor product system $(\varphi_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0^d}$ we conclude

$$f(x)=\sum_{\ell\in\mathbb{Z}^d}\mathcal{F}^{-1}[\varphi_{k+\ell}\mathcal{F}f](x)$$

with convergence in $S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and therefore in $C(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Here we used the convention that in the univariate case $\varphi_n\equiv 0$ if $n<0$ which implies $\varphi_{(k_1,\dots,k_d)}\equiv 0$ if $\min_j k_j<0$. Hence we have the decompositions

$$f(x)=\sum_{\ell\in\mathbb{Z}^d}\mathcal{F}^{-1}[\varphi_{k+\ell}\mathcal{F}f](x)\qquad\text{and}\qquad g(x)=\sum_{\nu\in\mathbb{Z}^d}\mathcal{F}^{-1}[\varphi_{k+\nu}\mathcal{F}g](x)\,,\qquad x\in\mathbb{R}^d\,,$$

with convergence in $C(\mathbb{R}^d)$. To simplify notation we put

$$f_\ell := \mathcal{F}^{-1}[\varphi_\ell \mathcal{F} f] \qquad \text{and} \qquad g_\ell := \mathcal{F}^{-1}[\varphi_\ell \mathcal{F} g]\,, \qquad \ell \in \mathbb{Z}^d\,.$$

Then we obtain from triangle inequality

$$\begin{aligned}\big\|\Delta_h^{2\bar m - u, e} f(\cdot + u \diamond h) \;\; & \Delta_h^{u,e} g(\cdot)\,|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\big\| \\ & \le \sum_{\ell,\nu\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \big\|\Delta_h^{2\bar m-u,e} f_{k+\ell}(\cdot + u\diamond h)\Delta_h^{u,e} g_{k+\nu}(\cdot)\,|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\big\|\,.\end{aligned}$$

We will estimate the sum on the right-hand side term by term. It follows

$$\begin{aligned}\big\|\Delta_h^{2\bar m - u, e} f_{k+\ell}(\cdot + u \diamond h) \;\; & \Delta_h^{u,e} g_{k+\nu}(\cdot)\,|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\big\| \\ & \le \Big(\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{d-L}} \sup_{\substack{x_i\in\mathbb{R}\\ i\le L}} \big|\Delta_h^{2\bar m-u,e} f_{k+\ell}(x + u\diamond h)\big|^p \prod_{i=L+1}^{d} dx_i\Big)^{1/p} \\ & \quad \times \quad \Big(\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{L}} \sup_{\substack{x_i\in\mathbb{R}\\ i> L}} \big|\Delta_h^{u,e} g_{k+\nu}(x)\big|^p \prod_{i=1}^{L} dx_i\Big)^{1/p}\end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathcal{F}_L$ denote the Fourier transform with respect to $(x_1,\dots,x_L)$. Observe that for any $h\in\mathbb{R}^L$

$$\operatorname{supp}\mathcal{F}_L(f_{k+\ell}(\cdot + h, x_{L+1},\dots,x_d)) \subset \{(\xi_1,\dots,\xi_L):\ |\xi_j|\le 3\,2^{k_j+\ell_j-1}\,,\ j=1,\dots,L\}\,,$$

independent of $x_{L+1},\dots x_d$. Consequently, Nikol'skijs inequality in Proposition 2.11 yields

$$\begin{aligned}\Big(\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{d-L}} \sup_{\substack{x_i\in\mathbb{R}\\ i\le L}} & \big|\Delta_h^{2\bar m-u,e} f_{k+\ell}(x + u\diamond h)\big|^p \prod_{i=L+1}^{d} dx_i\Big)^{1/p} \\ & \le \quad c_3 \prod_{i=1}^{L} 2^{(k_i+\ell_i)/p} \Big(\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^d} \big|\Delta_h^{2\bar m-u,e} f_{k+\ell}(x + u\diamond h)\big|^p dx\Big)^{1/p}\end{aligned}$$

with a constant c_3 independent of f, k and ℓ. A simple change of coordinates and an analogous argument with respect to $g_{k+\nu}$ results in

$$\begin{aligned}&\big\|\Delta_h^{2\bar m - u, e} f_{k+\ell}(\cdot + u \diamond h)\Delta_h^{u,e} g_{k+\nu}(\cdot)\,|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\big\| \\ &\le \quad c_4 \Big(\prod_{i=1}^{L} 2^{(k_i+\ell_i)/p}\Big)\Big(\prod_{i=L+1}^{d} 2^{(k_i+\nu_i)/p}\Big) \big\|\Delta_h^{2\bar m-u,e} f_{k+\ell}\big|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\big\|\,\big\|\Delta_h^{u,e} g_{k+\nu}\big|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\big\|\end{aligned}$$

We need one more notation. We put

$$\omega(\ell) := \{i\in\{1,\dots,d\}:\ \ell_i<0\} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \overline{\omega}(\ell) := \{i\in\{1,\dots,d\}:\ \ell_i\ge 0\}\,.$$

Writing $\Delta_h^{2\bar m-u,e}$ as

$$\Delta_h^{2\bar m-u,e} = \Big(\prod_{i\in\overline{\omega}(\ell)\cap e} \Delta_{h_i}^{2m-u_i}\Big)\Big(\prod_{i\in\omega(\ell)\cap e} \Delta_{h_i}^{2m-u_i}\Big)$$

it is easily seen that

$$\sup_{|h_i|<2^{k_i},\ i\in e} \big\|\Delta_h^{2\bar m-u,e} f_{k+\ell}\big|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\big\| \le c_5 \prod_{i\in\omega(\ell)\cap e} 2^{\ell_i(2m-u_i)}\,\big\|f_{k+\ell}\big|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\big\|\,,$$

where we have applied Lemma 2.14 and Proposition 2.12. Altogether we have found the estimate

$$\sup_{|h_i|<2^{k_i},\ i\in e} \big\|\Delta_h^{2\bar m-u,e} f_{k+\ell}(\cdot+u\diamond h)\Delta_h^{u,e} g_{k+\nu}(\cdot)\,|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\big\| \tag{4.4}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\le\ c_6\Big(\prod_{i=1}^{L}2^{(k_i+\ell_i)/p}\Big)\Big(\prod_{i=L+1}^{d}2^{(k_i+\nu_i)/p}\Big)\Big(\prod_{i\in\omega(\ell)\cap e}2^{\ell_i(2m-u_i)}\Big)\Big(\prod_{i\in\omega(\nu)\cap e}2^{\nu_i u_i}\Big)\\ &\quad\times\ \|f_{k+\ell}|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\|\,\|g_{k+\nu}|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \end{aligned}$$

with a constant c_6 independent of f, g, k, ℓ and ν. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} &2^{r|k|_1}\Big(\prod_{i=1}^{L}2^{(k_i+\ell_i)/p}\Big)\Big(\prod_{i=L+1}^{d}2^{(k_i+\nu_i)/p}\Big)\Big(\prod_{i\in\omega(\ell)\cap e}2^{\ell_i(2m-u_i)}\Big)\Big(\prod_{i\in\omega(\nu)\cap e}2^{\nu_i u_i}\Big)\\ &=\ \Big(\prod_{i=1}^{d}2^{(k_i+\ell_i)r}\,2^{(k_i+\nu_i)r}\Big)\Big(\prod_{i=1}^{L}2^{(k_i+\ell_i)(\frac1p-r)}\Big)\Big(\prod_{i=L+1}^{d}2^{(k_i+\nu_i)(\frac1p-r)}\Big)\Big(\prod_{i=1}^{L}2^{-\nu_i r}\Big)\\ &\times\ \Big(\prod_{i=L+1}^{N}2^{-\ell_i r}\Big)\Big(\prod_{i=N+1}^{d}2^{-\ell_i r}\Big)\Big(\prod_{i\in\omega(\ell)\cap e}2^{\ell_i(2m-u_i)}\Big)\Big(\prod_{i\in\omega(\nu)\cap e}2^{\nu_i u_i}\Big). \end{aligned}$$

Later on we will have to sum up only with respect to those terms where $\min_j(k_j+\ell_j)\ge 0$ or $\min_j(k_j+\nu_j)\ge 0$. Observe that $k\in\mathbb{N}_0^d(e)$, i.e., $k_{L+1}=\ldots=k_N=0$ and therefore $\ell_{N+1},\ldots,\ell_d\ge 0$. Taking this into account it is obvious that

$$\begin{aligned} &\Big(\prod_{i=N+1}^{d}2^{-\ell_i r}\Big)\,\Big(\prod_{i=1}^{L}2^{(k_i+\ell_i)(\frac1p-r)}\Big)\Big(\prod_{i=L+1}^{d}2^{(k_i+\nu_i)(\frac1p-r)}\Big)\\ &\qquad\le\ \Big(\prod_{i=N+1}^{d}2^{-(\ell_i+k_i)\varepsilon}\Big)\Big(\prod_{i=1}^{L}2^{-(k_i+\ell_i)\varepsilon}\Big)\Big(\prod_{i=L+1}^{d}2^{-(k_i+\nu_i)\varepsilon}\Big)\le 1 \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

if $\varepsilon=\min(r,r-1/p)$. Let $\delta:=\min(r,m-r)$. Clearly $\delta\in(0,1)$. Furthermore

$$\begin{aligned} \Big(\prod_{i=L+1}^{N}2^{-\ell_i r}\Big)\Big(\prod_{i\in\omega(\ell)\cap e}2^{\ell_i(2m-u_i)}\Big) &= \Big(\prod_{\substack{L<i\le N\\ i\in\bar\omega(\ell)}}2^{-\ell_i r}\Big)\Big(\prod_{\substack{L<i\le N\\ i\in\omega(\ell)}}2^{\ell_i(2m-u_i-r)}\Big)\Big(\prod_{\substack{1\le i\le L\\ i\in\omega(\ell)}}2^{\ell_i(2m-u_i)}\Big)\\ &\le\ \Big(\prod_{i=L+1}^{N}2^{-|\ell_i|\delta}\Big) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Big(\prod_{i=1}^{L}2^{-\nu_i r}\Big)\Big(\prod_{i\in\omega(\nu)\cap e}2^{\nu_i u_i}\Big) &= \Big(\prod_{\substack{L<i\le N\\ i\in\omega(\nu)}}2^{\nu_i u_i}\Big)\Big(\prod_{\substack{i\le L\\ i\in\omega(\nu)}}2^{\nu_i(u_i-r)}\Big)\Big(\prod_{\substack{i\le L\\ i\in\bar\omega(\nu)}}2^{-\nu_i r}\Big)\\ &\le\ \Big(\prod_{i=1}^{L}2^{-|\nu_i|\delta}\Big). \end{aligned}$$

Next we apply the inequality

$$\sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}_0}|a_j|\le c_7\Big(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}_0}2^{j\varepsilon p}|a_j|^p\Big)^{1/p},$$

valid for all $\varepsilon > 0$ with an appropriate constant c_7 depending on ε. This yields

$$\Big\{ \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0^d(e)} \Big[\sum_{\substack{\ell_i\in\mathbb{Z}, i\notin\{L+1,\dots,N\}\\ \nu_i\in\mathbb{Z}, L+1\le i\le d}} \sup_{|h_i|<2^{k_i},\ i\in e} \big\| \Delta_h^{2\bar m-u,e} f_{k+\ell}(\cdot+u\diamond h)\Delta_h^{u,e} g_{k+\nu}(\cdot)\,|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\big\| \Big]^p \Big\}^{1/p} \tag{4.6}$$

$$\le\ c_7 \Big\{ \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0^d(e)} \sum_{\substack{\ell_i\in\mathbb{Z}, i\notin\{L+1,\dots,N\}\\ \nu_i\in\mathbb{Z}, L+1\le i\le d}} \sup_{|h_i|<2^{k_i},\ i\in e} \big\| \Delta_h^{2\bar m-u,e} f_{k+\ell}(\cdot+u\diamond h)\Delta_h^{u,e} g_{k+\nu}(\cdot)\,|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\big\|^p \Big\}^{1/p}$$

$$\le\ c_8 \Big(\prod_{i=1}^{L} 2^{-|\nu_i|\delta}\Big)\Big(\prod_{i=L+1}^{N} 2^{-|\ell_i|\delta}\Big) \Big\{ \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0^d(e)} \sum_{\substack{\ell_i\in\mathbb{Z}, i\notin\{L+1,\dots,N\}\\ \nu_i\in\mathbb{Z}, L+1\le i\le d}} 2^{|k+\ell|_1 rp}\, 2^{|k+\nu|_1 rp}$$

$$\times\ \|f_{k+\ell}|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^p\, \|g_{k+\nu}|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^p \Big\}^{1/p},$$

see (4.4), (4.5). To prepare the next estimate we try to reorganize the summation in the sum in $\{\dots\}$. Therefore we consider

$$S(\ell_{L+1},\dots,\ell_N,\nu_1,\dots,\nu_L) := \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0^d(e)} \sum_{\substack{\ell_i\in\mathbb{Z}, i\notin\{L+1,\dots,N\}\\ \nu_i\in\mathbb{Z}, L+1\le i\le d}} 2^{|k+\ell|_1 rp}\, 2^{|k+\nu|_1 rp} a_{k+\ell}\, b_{k+\nu}\,,$$

where $\ell_{L+1},\dots,\ell_N,\nu_1,\dots,\nu_L$ are considered as fixed and $(a_n)_n$ and $(b_j)_j$ are sequence of non-negative numbers such that $a_n = b_j = 0$ if $\min_{i=1,\dots,d} n_i, \min_{i=1,\dots,d} j_i < 0$. Now we turn to an investigation of the linear system of equations

$$n_i := k_i + \ell_i\,, \qquad i\in\{1,\dots,N\}\,, \tag{4.7}$$

$$j_i := k_i + \nu_i\,, \qquad i\in\{1,\dots,N\}\,. \tag{4.8}$$

Here we consider $\ell_1,\dots,\ell_L,\nu_{L+1},\dots,\nu_N,k_1,\dots,k_N$ as variables. Obviously we are confronted with the following types of smaller systems of equations

$$\begin{aligned} n_i &:= k_i+\ell_i \\ j_i-\nu_i &:= k_i\,, \qquad i\in 1,\dots L\,, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} n_i-\ell_i &:= k_i \\ j_i &:= k_i+\nu_i\,, \qquad i\in\{L+1,\dots,N\}\,. \end{aligned}$$

Because of

$$\begin{vmatrix} 1 & 1\\ 1 & 0\end{vmatrix} = 1 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \begin{vmatrix} 1 & 0\\ 1 & 1\end{vmatrix} = 1$$

we know that the mapping

$$T(\ell_{L+1},\dots,\ell_N,\nu_1,\dots,\nu_L):\ (k_1,\dots,k_N,\ell_1,\dots,\ell_L,\nu_{L+1},\dots,\nu_N)\mapsto(n_1,\dots,n_N,j_1,\dots j_N)$$

is one-to-one. It maps $\mathbb{N}_0^N\times\mathbb{Z}^N$ onto a certain subset $\mathcal{T}(\ell_{L+1},\dots,\ell_N,\nu_1,\dots,\nu_L)$ of $\mathbb{Z}^{2N}$. Recall, $k_{N+1}=\dots=k_d=0$. We supplement our system (4.7), (4.8) by $n_i := \ell_i$ and $j_i := \nu_i$, $i = N+1,\dots,d$. Hence, we can extend T to an injective mapping defined on $\mathbb{Z}^{2d}$. We denote this

extension by $\mathbb{T}$. Let $n := (n_1, \dots, n_d)$ and $j := (j_1, \dots j_d)$. Now we can perform a change of summation according to $n = k + \ell$ and $j = k + \nu$ simultaneously. This leads to

$$\begin{aligned} S(\ell_{L+1}, \dots, \ell_N, \nu_1, \dots, \nu_L) \;&=\; \sum_{(n_1,\dots,n_N,j_1\dots,j_N)\in\mathcal{T}(\ell_{L+1},\dots,\ell_N,\nu_1,\dots,\nu_L)} \\ &\qquad \times \sum_{n_{N+1},\dots,n_d=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j_{N+1},\dots,j_d=0}^{\infty} 2^{|n|_1 rp}\, 2^{|j|_1 rp} a_n\, b_j\,. \end{aligned}$$

But this implies

$$S(\ell_{L+1}, \dots, \ell_N, \nu_1, \dots, \nu_L) \le \sum_{(n,j)\in\mathbb{N}_0^{2d}} 2^{|n|_1 rp}\, 2^{|j|_1 rp} a_n\, b_j\,.$$

Rewriting this inequality we have proved

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\{ \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0^d(e)} \sum_{\substack{\ell_i\in\mathbb{Z}, i\notin\{L+1,\dots,N\}\\ \nu_i\in\mathbb{Z}, L+1\le i\le d}} 2^{|k+\ell|_1 rp}\, 2^{|k+\nu|_1 rp} \|f_{k+\ell}|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^p\, \|g_{k+\nu}|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^p \right\}^{1/p} \\ &\qquad \le \left\{ \sum_{(n,j)\in\mathbb{N}_0^{2d}} 2^{|n|_1 rp}\, 2^{|j|_1 rp}\, \|f_n|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^p\, \|g_j|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^p \right\}^{1/p} \\ &\qquad \le \|f|S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\|\, \|g|S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\|\,. \end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

Now we are in position to estimate $S_{e,u}$ under the given restrictions. From (4.6) and (4.9) we derive

$$\begin{aligned} S_{e,u} \;&\le\; \left\{ \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0^d(e)} \Big[\sum_{\ell\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \sum_{\nu\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \sup_{|h_i|<2^{k_i},\ i\in e} \big\|\Delta_h^{2\bar{m}-u,e} f_{k+\ell}(\cdot + u\diamond h)\Delta_h^{u,e} g_{k+\nu}(\cdot)\,|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\big\| \Big]^p \right\}^{1/p} \\ &\le \sum_{\substack{\ell_i\in\mathbb{Z}, L<i\le N\\ \nu_i\in\mathbb{Z}, 1\le i\le L}} \left\{ \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0^d(e)} \Big[\sum_{\substack{\ell_i\in\mathbb{Z}, i\notin\{L+1,\dots,N\}\\ \nu_i\in\mathbb{Z}, L+1\le i\le d}} \dots \Big]^p \right\}^{1/p} \\ &\le c_8 \sum_{\substack{\ell_i\in\mathbb{Z}, L<i\le N\\ \nu_i\in\mathbb{Z}, 1\le i\le L}} \Big(\prod_{i=1}^{L} 2^{-|\nu_i|\delta}\Big)\Big(\prod_{i=L+1}^{N} 2^{-|\ell_i|\delta}\Big) \|\,f\,|S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\|\, \|\,g\,|S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \\ &\le c_9\, \|\,f\,|S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\|\, \|\,g\,|S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \end{aligned}$$

with c_9 independent of f and g. This proves the claim in case $r > 1/p$.
Substep 3.2 Let $p = 1$ and $r = 1$. We shall use (4.4) with $\varepsilon = 0$ and obtain

$$S_{e,u} \le \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0^d(e)} \sum_{\ell\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \sum_{\nu\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \sup_{|h_i|<2^{k_i},\ i\in e} \big\|\Delta_h^{2\bar{m}-u,e} f_{k+\ell}(\cdot + u\diamond h)\Delta_h^{u,e} g_{k+\nu}(\cdot)\,|L_1(\mathbb{R}^d)\big\|$$

Now we can continue as in the previous substep.
Step 4. Proof of the necessity of the restrictions. Let $r > 0$ and $1 \le p \le \infty$. Then the isotropic Besov space $B^r_{p,p}(\mathbb{R})$ is an algebra if and only if either $r > 1/p$ or $r = p = 1$, see [27, Thm. 2.6.2/1], [28, Thm. 2.8.3] or [18, Thm. 4.6.4/1]. Hence, if either $r = 1/p$ for some $1 < p < \infty$ or $0 < r < 1/p$, $1 \le p < \infty$, there exist two sequences $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset B^r_{p,p}(\mathbb{R})$ and $\{g_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset B^r_{p,p}(\mathbb{R})$ such that

$$\|f_n \cdot g_n|B^r_{p,p}(\mathbb{R})\| \ge n\, \|f_n|B^r_{p,p}(\mathbb{R})\|\, \|g_n|B^r_{p,p}(\mathbb{R})\|\,, \qquad n \in \mathbb{N}\,.$$

Let $\Psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, $\Psi \not\equiv 0$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x = (x_1, ..., x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we define the sequences

$$F_n(x) := f_n(x_1) \cdot \Psi(x_2) \cdot ... \cdot \Psi(x_d) \quad \text{and} \quad G_n(x) = g_n(x_1) \cdot \Psi(x_2) \cdot ... \cdot \Psi(x_d)\,.$$

The cross-norm property of $S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ yields $\{F_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\{G_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Using the cross-norm property once again we find

$$\begin{aligned} \| F_n \cdot G_n \,|S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\| &= \| f_n \cdot g_n \,|B^r_{p,p}(\mathbb{R})\| \, \|\Psi^2|B^r_{p,p}(\mathbb{R})\|^{d-1} \\ &\geq n \, \|f_n|B^r_{p,p}(\mathbb{R})\| \, \|g_n|B^r_{p,p}(\mathbb{R})\| \, \|\Psi^2|B^r_{p,p}(\mathbb{R})\|^{d-1} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\|F_n|S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \cdot \|G_n|S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\| = \|f_n|B^r_{p,p}(\mathbb{R})\| \, \|g_n|B^r_{p,p}(\mathbb{R})\| \, \|\Psi|B^r_{p,p}(\mathbb{R})\|^{2(d-1)}\,.$$

This obviously disproves that $S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is a multiplication algebra. ■

Proof of Theorem 3.13. *Step 1.* Let $r > 1/p$. It will be convenient for us to switch to an equivalent norm on $B^r_{p,p}(\mathbb{R})$ given by

$$\|h|B^r_{p,p}(\mathbb{R})\| \asymp \| \, h \, |L_p(\mathbb{R})\| + \Big(\int_0^\infty \, t^{-rp} \, \omega_m(h,t)^p \frac{dt}{t} \Big)^{1/p}.$$

with $m > r$ (compare with (2.1)). Obviously the two terms on the right-hand side have different homogeneity properties. We have

$$\|h(\lambda \, \cdot)|L_p(\mathbb{R})\| = \lambda^{-1/p} \, \|h|L_p(\mathbb{R})\|$$

and

$$\Big(\int_0^\infty \, t^{-rp} \, \omega_m(h(\lambda \, \cdot \,), t)^p \frac{dt}{t} \Big)^{1/p} = \lambda^{r-1/p} \Big(\int_0^\infty \, t^{-rp} \, \omega_m(h,t)^p \frac{dt}{t} \Big)^{1/p}, \qquad \lambda > 0\,.$$

Let $f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ with $\operatorname{supp} f \subset [-2,2]$, $f(t) = 1$ if $t \in [-1,1]$ and $\sup_t |f(t)| = 1$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we define $f_n(t) := f(2^n t)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Hence we have

$$\|f_n|L_\infty(\mathbb{R})\| = 1 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \|f_n|B^r_{p,p}(\mathbb{R})\| \asymp 2^{n(r-1/p)}.$$

Let $g \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that $g(t) = 1$ if $t \in [-2,2]$ and $\sup_t |g(t)| = 1$. It follows

$$\|g|L_\infty(\mathbb{R})\| \asymp \|g|B^r_{p,p}(\mathbb{R})\| \asymp 1 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \|f_n g|B^r_{p,p}(\mathbb{R})\| \asymp 2^{n(r-1/p)}.$$

For $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we put

$$F_n(x) := f_n(x_1) \prod_{j=2}^d g(x_j) \qquad \text{and} \qquad G_n(x) := g(x_1) \cdot f_n(x_2) \cdot \prod_{j=3}^d g(x_j)\,.$$

The crossnorm property and $f_n \cdot g = f_n$ imply that

$$\|F_n \cdot G_n|S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \asymp 2^{2n(r-1/p)}$$

and

$$\|F_n|S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \cdot \|G_n|L_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)\| = \|G_n|S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \cdot \|F_n|L_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \asymp 2^{n(r-1/p)}.$$

This proves the claim in case $r > 1/p$.
Step 2. Let $0 < r \leq 1/p$. This time the argument can not rely on the differential dimension $r - \frac{1}{p}$.

Our construction is oriented in the observation made after (3.1). For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we define ϕ_n such that $\phi_n(t) = 1$ if $1/n \le t \le 1$, $\phi_n(t) = \phi_1(t)$, $t \ge 1$ and $\operatorname{supp} \phi_n \subset [\frac{1}{2n}, 3/2]$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. We put

$$f_n(t) := \phi_n(t)\, t\, \sin(t^{-\varepsilon})\,, \qquad t > 0\,.$$

For $t \le 0$ we put $f_n(t) = 0$.

Substep 2.1. Let $0 < r < 1$. Then we assume in addition that ϕ_n is linear on $[\frac{1}{2n}, \frac{1}{n}]$ and $[1, 3/2]$, i.e.,

$$\phi_n(t) = 2n(t - \frac{1}{2n})\,, \qquad \frac{1}{2n} \le t \le \frac{1}{n}\,,$$

and

$$\phi_n(t) = 2\,(\frac{3}{2} - t)\,, \qquad 1 \le t \le \frac{3}{2}\,.$$



Figure 1

Altogether f_n is Lipschitz for all n and

$$\sup_t |f_n(t)| \le 1\,.$$

To estimate the norm in $B^r_{p,p}(\mathbb{R})$ we proceed by real interpolation. First we investigate the norm in $W^1_p(\mathbb{R})$. By assuming $\varepsilon > 1/p$, $\varepsilon \ne 1 + 1/p$, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_n' | L_p(\mathbb{R})\| &\asymp \Big(\int_{1/n}^1 |\sin(t^{-\varepsilon}) - \varepsilon\, t^{-\varepsilon}\, \cos(t^{-\varepsilon})|^p dt \Big)^{1/p} + 2n \Big(\int_{1/(2n)}^{1/n} |\, t^{1-\varepsilon}\,|^p dt \Big)^{1/p} \\ &\asymp n^{\varepsilon - 1/p}\,. \end{aligned}$$

Next we employ

$$(L_p(\mathbb{R}), W^1_p(\mathbb{R}))_{r,p} = B^r_{p,p}(\mathbb{R})$$

in the sense of equivalent norms, see, e.g., [1, Chapt. 6] and [28, 2.4]. The related interpolation inequality

$$\|f_n | B^r_{p,p}(\mathbb{R})\| \lesssim \|f_n | L_p(\mathbb{R})\|^{1-r}\, \|f_n | W^1_p(\mathbb{R})\|^r$$

yields

$$\|f_n | B^r_{p,p}(\mathbb{R})\| \lesssim n^{(\varepsilon - 1/p)r}\,. \tag{4.10}$$

Employing the characterization by first order differences of $B^r_{p,p}(\mathbb{R})$ one can show that there exists some positive constant c such that

$$\|f_n | B^r_{p,p}(\mathbb{R})\| \ge c\, n^{(\varepsilon - 1/p)r}\,, \qquad n \in \mathbb{N}\,. \tag{4.11}$$

This is a bit technical, one may take the proof of Lemma 2.3.1/1 in [18] as an orientation. Now we are in position to define our test functions. Let ψ be a nontrivial C^∞_0 function on $\mathbb{R}$ such that $\psi(t) = 1$ if $t \in \operatorname{supp} f_n$ and $\sup_t |\psi(t)| = 1$. Then we put

$$F_n(x) := f_n(x_1) \prod_{j=2}^d \psi(x_j)\,, \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^d\,, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}\,.$$

and

$$G_n(x) := \psi(x_1)\, f_n(x_2) \prod_{j=3}^{d} \psi(x_j)\,, \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^d\,, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}\,.$$

From the cross-norm property we derive

$$\|F_n|S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \asymp \|G_n|S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \asymp \|f_n|B^r_{p,p}(\mathbb{R})\| \asymp n^{(\varepsilon-1/p)r}$$

and analogously

$$\|F_n \cdot G_n|S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \asymp \|f_n|B^r_{p,p}(\mathbb{R})\|^2 \asymp n^{2(\varepsilon-1/p)r}\,, \qquad n \in \mathbb{N}\,.$$

In view of $\|F_n|L_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)\|,\ \|G_n|L_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \le 1$ this proves the claim.
Step 2. Let $r = p = 1$. We need to modify our construction. We will be rather sketchy. In Step 1 f_n was Lipschitz. This time we need to have the first derivative to be Lipschitz. By smoothing ϕ_n in such a way that ϕ_n' is Lipschitz, see Figure 2, we can prove

$$\|f_n''|L_1(\mathbb{R})\| \asymp n^{\varepsilon}\,,$$

or with other words

$$\|f_n|W^2_1(\mathbb{R})\| \asymp n^{\varepsilon}\,,$$

Now we proceed by using

$$(L_1(\mathbb{R}), W^2_1(\mathbb{R}))_{1/2,1} = B^1_{1,1}(\mathbb{R})\,.$$



Figure 2

Repeating the above arguments we can prove the claim also in this situation. ■

To characterize $M(S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d))$ we need the so-called localization property for the Besov spaces $S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$. For it's proof we need another characterization by differences. This time we shall work with pure differences (not with associated moduli of smoothness).

Lemma 4.2. *Let $1 \le p \le \infty$ and $r > 0$. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ be a natural number such that $m > r$. A function $f \in L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ belongs to $S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ if and only if*

$$T_e := \Big\{ \int_{[-1,1]^{|e|}} \prod_{i\in e} |h_i|^{-rp} \big\|\Delta^{\bar m,e}_h f(\cdot)\big|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\big\|^p \prod_{i\in e} \frac{dh_i}{|h_i|} \Big\}^{1/p} < \infty\,,$$

for all $e \subset [d]$. It follows that

$$\|f|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\| + \sum_{e\subset[d], e\neq\emptyset} T_e$$

is an equivalent norm on $S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Remark 4.3. A proof of a slightly modified statement (integration with respect to the components t_i is taken on $(0,\infty)$, not on $(0,1]$) can be found in [29]. The reduction to the case considered in Lemma 4.2 can be done by standard arguments, we omit details.

Proposition 4.4. *Let $1 \le p \le \infty$ and $r > 0$. Let ψ be a non-negative $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ function such that*

$$\sum_{\mu\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \psi(x-\mu) = 1 \qquad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^d\,. \tag{4.12}$$

We put $\psi_\mu(x) := \psi(x-\mu)$, $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then

$$\|f|S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \asymp \Big(\sum_{\mu\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \|\psi_\mu f|S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^p\Big)^{1/p}$$

holds for all $f \in S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ (usual modification for $p=\infty$).

Proof. We prove for $1 \le p < \infty$. The proof for $p = \infty$ is modification.
Step 1. We shall prove that

$$\|f|S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \lesssim \Big(\sum_{\mu\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \|\psi_\mu f|S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^p\Big)^{1/p} \tag{4.13}$$

holds for all $f \in S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Again we shall work with the characterization by differences. Let m be a natural number such that $r < m \le r+1$. Then, applying (4.12), the compactness of the support of ψ and $|h|_\infty \le 1$, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
\|f|S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^p &\lesssim \sum_{e\subset[d]}\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0^d(e)} 2^{r|k|_1 p} \sup_{|h_i|<2^{-k_i},i\in e} \Big\| \sum_{\mu\in\mathbb{Z}^d} |\Delta_h^m(f\psi_\mu)(\cdot)|\Big| L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\Big\|^p \\
&\lesssim \sum_{e\subset[d]}\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0^d(e)} 2^{r|k|_1 p} \sup_{|h_i|<2^{-k_i},i\in e} \sum_{\mu\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \big\|\Delta_h^m(f\psi_\mu)(\cdot)\big| L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\big\|^p \\
&\lesssim \sum_{\mu\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \|\psi_\mu f|S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^p.
\end{aligned}$$

This proves (4.13).
Step 2. We shall prove the reverse direction to (4.13). In some sense we will follow the same strategy as in proof of Theorem 3.10. Within this step we will use the characterization of $S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ given in Lemma 4.2.
Substep 2.1. Some preparations. Let $r < m \le r+1$. Clearly, in case $e = \emptyset$ we have

$$\sum_{\mu\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \|f\psi_\mu|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^p \lesssim \|f|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^p \lesssim \|f|S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\|^p.$$

For $e \subset [d]$, $e \ne \emptyset$ we use

$$\Delta_h^{2\bar m,e}(f\cdot\psi_\mu)(x) = \sum_{u\in\mathbb{N}_0^d(e),\,|u|_\infty\le 2m} \binom{2\bar m}{u} \Delta_h^{2\bar m-u,e} f(x+u\diamond h)\Delta_h^{u,e}\psi_\mu(x)\,, \quad x,h\in\mathbb{R}^d\,,$$

see (4.3). Recall $2\bar m - u := (2m-u_1,...,2m-u_d)$. It remains to estimate the terms

$$S_{e,u} := \Big\{\sum_{\mu\in\mathbb{Z}^d}\int_{[-1,1]^{|e|}} \prod_{i\in e}|h_i|^{-rp}\big\|\Delta_h^{2\bar m-u,e} f(\cdot+u\diamond h)\Delta_h^{u,e}\psi_\mu(\cdot)\big| L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\big\|^p \prod_{i\in e}\frac{dh_i}{|h_i|}\Big\}^{1/p}.$$

This will be done by using the same splitting into various cases as done in the proof of Theorem 3.10.

Substep 2.2. The case $u_i < m$ for all $i \in e$. By assumption ψ has compact support and therefore $\operatorname{supp}\psi_\mu$ is contained in a cube $Q(\mu, c)$ with center in μ and sidelength $c > 0$. Because of $|h|_\infty \le 1$ we find

$$|\Delta_h^{u,e}\psi_\mu(x)| = 0 \qquad \text{if} \qquad \|x-\mu\|_\infty > R := c + 2m\,. \tag{4.14}$$

Obviously it holds

$$|\Delta_h^{2\bar m - u,e} f(x + u\diamond h)\Delta_h^{u,e}\psi_\mu(x)| \lesssim \|\psi|C(\mathbb{R}^d)\|\,|\Delta_h^{2\bar m-u,e}f(x+u\diamond h)|\,. \tag{4.15}$$

Combining (4.15) and (4.14) we derive

$$\begin{aligned} S_{e,u} &\lesssim \Big\{\int_{[-1,1]^{|e|}} \prod_{i\in e}|h_i|^{-rp} \sum_{\mu\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \big\|\Delta_h^{2\bar m-u,e} f(\cdot + u\diamond h)\big|L_p(Q(\mu,R))\big\|^p \prod_{i\in e}\frac{dh_i}{|h_i|}\Big\}^{1/p} \\ &\lesssim \Big\{\int_{[-1,1]^{|e|}} \prod_{i\in e}|h_i|^{-rp} \big\|\Delta_h^{2\bar m-u,e} f(\cdot + u\diamond h)\big|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\big\|^p \prod_{i\in e}\frac{dh_i}{|h_i|}\Big\}^{1/p} \\ &\lesssim \|f|S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\|\,. \end{aligned}$$

Substep 2.3. The case $u_i \ge m$ for all $i \in e$. Let $0 < \varepsilon < m - r$. Directly from the definition of the spaces $S^{r+\varepsilon}_{\infty,\infty}B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we derive the inequality

$$\prod_{i\in e}|h_i|^{-(r+\varepsilon)}|\Delta_h^{u,e}\psi_\mu(x)| \le \|\psi_\mu|S^{r+\varepsilon}_{\infty,\infty}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\| = \|\psi|S^{r+\varepsilon}_{\infty,\infty}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\|\,. \tag{4.16}$$

This inequality, combined with (4.14), results in

$$\begin{aligned} S_{e,u} &\lesssim \Big\{\int_{[-1,1]^{|e|}} \prod_{i\in e}|h_i|^{\varepsilon p} \sum_{\mu\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \big\|\Delta_h^{2\bar m-u,e} f(\cdot + u\diamond h)\big|L_p(Q(\mu,R))\big\|^p \prod_{i\in e}\frac{dh_i}{|h_i|}\Big\}^{1/p} \\ &\lesssim \|f|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\|\Big\{\int_{[-1,1]^{|e|}} \prod_{i\in e}\frac{dh_i}{|h_i|^{1-\varepsilon p}}\Big\}^{1/p} \\ &\lesssim \|f|S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\|\,. \end{aligned} \tag{4.17}$$

Step 3. The remaining cases. Let there exist $L, N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $e = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$, $u \in \mathbb{N}_0^d(e)$ and

$$u := (u_1, \dots, u_L, u_{L+1}, ..., u_N, 0, \dots, 0)$$

with

$$m \le u_i \le 2m\,, \quad i = 1, \dots, L, \qquad 0 \le u_i < m, \quad i = L+1, \dots, N,$$

and $L < N \le d$. By assuming $|u|_\infty > m$ we cover all remaining cases up to an enumeration. Let $e_1 := \{1, \dots, L\}$ and $e_2 := e \setminus e_1$. As in (4.16) we conclude

$$|\Delta_h^{u,e}\psi_\mu(x)| \lesssim \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d}|\Delta_h^{u,e_1}\psi_\mu(x)| \le \|\psi|S^{r+\varepsilon}_{\infty,\infty}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\| \prod_{i\in e_1}|h_i|^{r+\varepsilon}\,.$$

In a similar way as in (4.17) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} S_{e,u} &\lesssim \Big\{\int_{[-1,1]^{|e|}} \Big(\prod_{i\in e}|h_i|^{-r}\prod_{i\in e_1}|h_i|^{r+\varepsilon}\Big)^p \sum_{\mu\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \big\|\Delta_h^{2\bar m-u,e} f(\cdot + u\diamond h)\big|L_p(Q(\mu,R))\big\|^p \prod_{i\in e}\frac{dh_i}{|h_i|}\Big\}^{1/p} \\ &\lesssim \Big\{\int_{[-1,1]^{|e|}} \Big(\prod_{i\in e_2}|h_i|^{-r}\prod_{i\in e_1}|h_i|^{\varepsilon}\Big)^p \big\|\Delta_h^{2\bar m-u,e} f(\cdot + u\diamond h)\big|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\big\|^p \prod_{i\in e}\frac{dh_i}{|h_i|}\Big\}^{1/p}. \end{aligned}$$

Next we apply the elementary inequality

$$\big\|\Delta_h^{2\bar{m}-u,e} f(\cdot + u \diamond h)\big|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\big\| \lesssim \big\|\Delta_h^{m,e_2} f(\cdot)\big|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\big\|$$

since $2m - u_i \geq m$ if $i \in e_2$. Hence, we get

$$\begin{aligned} S_{e,u} &\lesssim \left\{ \int_{[-1,1]^{|e_2|}} \prod_{i\in e_2} |h_i|^{-rp} \big\|\Delta_h^{m,e_2} f(\cdot)\big|L_p(\mathbb{R}^d)\big\|^p \prod_{i\in e} \frac{dh_i}{|h_i|} \right\}^{1/p} \left\{ \int_{[-1,1]^{|e_1|}} \prod_{i\in e_1} \frac{dh_i}{|h_i|^{1-\varepsilon p}} \right\}^{1/p} \\ &\lesssim \|f|S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)\|\,. \end{aligned}$$

as a consequence of Lemma 4.2. This finishes the proof. ■

Proof of Theorem 3.12. By employing Proposition 4.4, Theorem 3.10 and similar arguments as in the proof of Theorem 3.17 one obtains the claimed identity $M(S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)) = S^r_{p,p}B(\mathbb{R}^d)_{\rm unif}$. ■

4.3 Proof of the results in Section 3.3

By definition the positive results (sufficient conditions) carry over to the local case. Concerning the necessary conditions it remains to observe that all test functions used in this context for the proof on $\mathbb{R}^d$ had compact support. From these remarks Theorem 3.16 and Theorem 3.18 follow. Concerning the proof of Theorem 3.17 we remark that the embedding of $S^m_pW(\Omega) \hookrightarrow M(S^m_pW(\Omega))$ follows from the algebra property. If we assume $f \in M(S^m_pW(\Omega)$ we conclude that

$$\|f \cdot g|S^m_pW(\Omega)\| \leq c\,\|g|S^m_pW(\Omega)\|$$

holds for all $g \in S^m_pW(\Omega)$. But the function $g = 1$ belongs to $S^m_pW(\Omega)$. Hence, f must be an element of $S^m_pW(\Omega)$. Similarly we argue in case of $S^r_{p,p}B(\Omega)$. ■

References

[1] J. Bergh and J. Löfström, *Interpolation Spaces. An Introduction.* Springer, New York, 1976.

[2] H.-J. Bungartz and M. Griebel, Sparse grids, *Acta Numer.* **13** (2004), 147–269.

[3] M. Hansen, Nonlinear approximation and function spaces of dominating mixed smoothness. Phd thesis, Friedrich-Schiller-University Jena, Jena, 2010.

[4] W.A. Light and E.W. Cheney, *Approximation theory in tensor product spaces*, Lecture Notes in Math. **1169**, Springer, Berlin, 1985.

[5] P.I. Lizorkin, On Fourier multipliers in the spaces $L_{p,\theta}$, *Trudy Mat. Inst. Steklova* **89** (1967), 231-248.

[6] P. I. Lizorkin, Multipliers of Fourier integrals and bounds of convolution in spaces with mixed norms. Applications. Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat. Tom **34** (1970), No. 1, 225-256.

[7] P.I. Lizorkin, On the theory of Fourier multipliers, *Trudy Mat. Inst. Steklova* **173** (1986), 149-163.

[8] L. Markhasin, V.K. Nguyen and I. Steinwart, Support vector machines for Sobolev function regression over deterministic cubature rules, work in progress, Stuttgart, Jena, 2016.

[9] V.G. Maz'ya and T.O. Shaposhnikova, Theory of multipliers in spaces of differentiable functions, Pitman, Boston, 1985.

[10] V.G. Maz'ya and T.O. Shaposhnikova, Theory of Sobolev multipliers with applications to differential and integral operators, Springer, Berlin, 2009.

[11] J. Moser, A rapidly convergent iteration method and non-linear differential equations. I. Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa **20** (1966), 265-315. *II.* ibid. **20** (1966), 499-535.

[12] S.M. Nikol'skij, *Approximation of Functions of Several Variables and Imbedding Theorems*. Springer, Berlin, 1975.

[13] V.K. Nguyen, M. Ullrich and T. Ullrich, Change of variable in spaces of mixed smoothness and numerical integration of multivariate functions on the unit cube, submitted, http://arxiv.org/abs/1511.02036.

[14] E. Novak and H. Woźniakowski, Tractability of multivariate problems. Volume I: Linear information. EMS, Zürich, 2008.

[15] E. Novak and H. Woźniakowski, Tractability of multivariate problems. Volume II: Standard information for functionals. EMS, Zürich, 2010.

[16] E. Novak and H. Woźniakowski, Tractability of multivariate problems. Volume III: Standard information for operators. EMS, Zürich, 2012.

[17] J. Peetre, *New thoughts on Besov spaces.* Duke Univ. Press, Durham, 1976.

[18] T. Runst and W. Sickel, *Sobolev Spaces of Fractional Order, Nemytskij Operators, and Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations*. de Gruyter Series in Nonlinear Analysis and Applications 3, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 1996.

[19] H.-J. Schmeisser, H. Triebel, *Topics in Fourier analysis and function spaces.* Geest & Portig, Leipzig, 1987 and Wiley, Chichester, 1987.

[20] Ch. Schwab, E. Süli and R.A. Todor, Sparse finite element approximation of high-dimensional transport-dominated diffusion problems, *ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis* **42** (05) (2008), 777–819.

[21] W. Sickel and T. Ullrich, Tensor products of Sobolev-Besov spaces and applications to approximation from the hyperbolic cross, *J. Approx. Theory* **161** (2009), 748–786.

[22] W. Sickel and T. Ullrich, Spline interpolation on sparse grids, *Applicable Analysis* **90** (2011), 337–383.

[23] I. Steinwarth and C. Christmann, Support vector machines. Information Science and Statitics, Springer, New York, 2008.

[24] B. Stöckert, Ungleichungen vom Plancherel-Polya-Nikol'skij-Typ in gewichteten L_p^Ω-Räumen mit gemischten Normen. Math. Nachr. **86** (1978), 19-32.

[25] R. S. Strichartz, Multiplier on fractional Sobolev spaces, J. Math. Mech. **16** (1967) 1031-1060.

[26] V.N. Temlyakov, Approximation of periodic functions, Nova Science, New York, 1993.

[27] H. Triebel, *Besov-Sobolev-Hardy spaces.* Teubner-Texte zur Math., Teubner, Leipzig, 1978.

[28] H. Triebel, *Theory of function spaces*. Birkhäuser, Basel, 1983.

[29] T. Ullrich, Function spaces with dominating mixed smoothness. Characterizations by differences. *Jenaer Schriften zur Mathematik und Informatik* Math/Inf/05/06, Jena, 2006.

[30] A.P. Uninskij, Embedding theorems for a class of functions with mixed norms. Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR **166** (1966), 806-808.

[31] A.P. Uninskij, Inequalities in a mixed norm for trigonometric polynomials and entire functions of finite order. In "Embedding theorems and applications" Nauka, Moscow, 1970, 212-218.

[32] J. Vybiral, Function spaces with dominating mixed smoothness. *Dissertationes Math.* **436** (2006).

[33] E. Zeidler, Nonlinear functional analysis and its applications. Vol. II/A, Springer, New York, 1990.